REMARKS

Claims remaining in the present patent application are numbered 1-23. The rejections and comments of the Examiner set forth in the Office Action dated November 17, 2004 have been carefully considered by the Applicants. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to consider and allow the remaining claims.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

The present Office Action rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuzaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,140,992), in view of Kim et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,355,443), and Singla et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,597,373). Also, Claims 2-4, 7, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuzaki et al. in view of Kim, Hannah (U.S. Patent No. 5,038,297), and Yuki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,805,149), further in view of Ogawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,018,331) and Singla et al. Further, Claims 5, 6, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuzaki et al. in view of Kim et al. and Hannah; Yuki et al. and Singla et al. Moreover, Claims 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuzaki et al. in view of Kim et al. and Hannah, further in view of Ogawa et al., and Singla et al. Also, Claims 18-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuzaki et al. in view of Kim et Palm-3541.CIP/ACM/LCH Serial No.: 09/724,197 Group Art Unit: 2672 Examiner: Wang, J.

al. and Hannah and Yuki et al., further in view of Ogawa, Singla, and He et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6323,849).

Applicants have reviewed the above cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention, as recited in Claims 1-23, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the Matsuzaki et al. reference taken alone or in combination with the Singla et al., Kim et al., Hannah, Yuki et al., Ogawa et al., and He et al. references.

Independent Claims 1, 10, and 18

Applicants respectfully point out that embodiments of the present invention as claimed in amended independent Claims 1, 10, and 18 each recite, in part:

a border attribute register for containing said display attribute for said border region, wherein said display attribute is <u>automatically selected</u> to provide viewing contrast with [image data or character images] located near said border region . . . (Emphasis Added)

Specifically, the claimed embodiments of the present invention pertain to a controllable pixel border that surrounds a frame buffer region for improved viewability of a display device. That is, the pixel border displays a display attribute. For instance, the pixel border is useful for increasing viewability, e.g., contrast, of images and/or characters that are displayed along the edge of a frame buffer region.

Palm-3541.CIP/ACM/LCH 10
Examiner: Wang, J.

O Serial No.: 09/724,197

Group Art Unit: 2672

In particular, embodiments of the present invention as claimed in independent Claims 1, 10, and 18, recite, unlike the prior art references which do not disclose a controllable pixel border region, a pixel border region that displays a display attribute that is <u>automatically selected</u> to provide viewing contrast with images and/or characters in the pixel frame buffer region that are located near the pixel border region.

Applicants respectfully note that the prior art reference, Matsuzaki et al., does not teach nor suggest a controllable pixel border region of the present invention. Specifically, Applicants agree with the present Office Action that "it is also not clear whether Matsuzaki implicitly teaches a display attribute being selected to provide viewing contrast with image data located near the border region." The Matsuzaki et al. reference discloses a display control system for controlling the display format to be displayed by a display apparatus. That is, the Matsuzaki et al. reference discloses a border section that displays border pixel data to frame a display image frame. As such, for reasons set forth above and in previous responses to Office Actions in the present Application, Applicants respectfully point out the Matsuzaki et al. reference does not teach or suggest a pixel border region displaying a display attribute that is automatically selected to provide viewing contrast with

Palm-3541.CIP/ACM/LCH 11 Serial No.: 09/724,197 Examiner: Wang, J. Group Art Unit: 2672

images and/or characters near the border region, as in embodiments of the present invention as claimed in independent Claims 1, 10, and 18. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention as disclosed in independent Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the Matsuzaki et al. reference.

Moreover, the Singla et al. reference fails to remedy the shortcomings of the Matsuzaki et al. reference. Specifically, Applicants respectfully note that the prior art reference, Singla et al., does not teach nor suggest a controllable border region that displays a border attribute that is automatically selected to provide viewing contrast with image data or character images located near the border region. In contrast to independent Claims 1, 10, and 18 of embodiments of the present invention, the Singla et al. reference discloses a display controller that is capable of generating image borders based on scanning resolution information. Applicants agree that the Singla et al. reference discloses a solid single-color border surrounding the image in column 8. However, Applicants respectfully assert that the Singla et al. reference does not teach the claim limitation of a pixel border region displaying a display attribute that is <u>automatically selected</u> to provide viewing contrast with images and/or characters near the border region, as recited in independent Claims 1, 10 and 18 of the present invention. Instead, Applicants assert that Palm-3541.CIP/ACM/LCH 12 Serial No.: 09/724,197

Examiner: Wang, J. Group Art Unit: 2672 the predetermined border scheme is adjusted by user override. That is, the border scheme can be adjusted for the user to select a static color for the border region, according to the "user preferences." As such, for reasons set forth above and in previous responses to Office Actions in the present Application, Applicants respectfully assert that the selectable color as determined by the "user preferences" in the Singla et al. reference does not disclose the automatic selection of the display attribute to provide viewing contrast with the image data or character images located near the border region, as recited in independent Claims 1, 10, and 18.

Moreover, the Kim et al., Hannah, Yuki et al., Ogawa et al., and He et al. prior art references also do not teach, suggest, or disclose a pixel border region displaying a display attribute that is <u>automatically selected</u> to provide viewing contrast with image data and/or character images near the border region, as in embodiments of the present invention as claimed in independent Claims 1, 10, and 18.

Thus, Applicants respectfully contend that embodiments of the present invention as claimed in independent Claims 1, 10, and 18 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the Matsuzaki et al., taken alone or in combination with the Singla et al., Kim et al., Hannah, Yuki et al., Ogawa et al., and He et al. references, and are in a condition for Palm-3541.CIP/ACM/LCH 13 Serial No.: 09/724,197

Group Art Unit: 2672

Examiner: Wang, J.

allowance. As a result, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-9 which depend from independent Claim 1, as currently amended, are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim. Also, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 11-17 which depend from independent Claim 10, as currently amended, are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 19-23 which depend from independent Claim 18, as currently amended, are also in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

In light of the facts and arguments presented herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected Claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-23 overcome the rejections of record. Therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

Palm-3541.CIP/ACM/LCH 14 Serial No.: 09/724,197 Examiner: Wang, J. Group Art Unit: 2672

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants'
undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such
action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP

Date: 18 April 2005

Reg. No.: 46,315

Two North Market Street

Third Floor

San Jose, California 95113

Group Art Unit: 2672